DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 093 EA 015 173

AUTHOR Broussard, Rolland L.
TITLE Inservice Activities Selected by School Administrators under an Individualized Statewide Incentive Program.
PUB DATE 17 Aug 82
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (36th, San Marcos, TX, August 15-20, 1982). For a related document, see ED 212 057.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrators; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Incentives; *Inservice Education; *Participation; *Professional Development; State Programs; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS Louisiana

ABSTRACT

A study of participation in the Louisiana Educational Employees Professional Improvement Program (PIPS) by the administrators in two parish (county) school systems indicated that the program was very attractive and that a wide variety of university courses, workshops, conferences, and conventions were attended under the program. PIPS, made operational in July 1981, provides monetary incentives to educators who improve their skills or abilities while following a personally prepared 5-year plan of professional development involving both academic and inservice projects. The school systems studied were selected as representative of the systems in the state. Over 90 percent of the administrators in these two systems participated. Tables present the types of academic and inservice pursuits undertaken by principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators in each school system (as well as percentages of each type of administrator participating), the numbers of administrators pursuing college courses on campus or by extension, and sample listings of formal courses and inservice activities in which administrators typically participated. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224093

INSERVICE ACTIVITIES SELECTED BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS UNDER AN INDIVIDUALIZED STATEWIDE INCENTIVE PROGRAM

by

Rolland L. Broussard, Ed.D.
Professor of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rolland L Broussard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the
National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration

EA 015 173

San Marcos, Texas
August 17, 1982

INSERVICE ACTIVITIES SELECTED BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS UNDER AN INDIVIDUALIZED STATEWIDE INCENTIVE PROGRAM

by

Rolland L. Broussard, Ed.D.
Professor of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana

Introduction

At the 1981, NCPEA meeting it was reported that Louisiana had recently enacted and implemented a statewide inservice program. (Broussard, 1981) The program was described as an individualized incentive program designed primarily for public elementary and secondary classroom teachers, but librarians, principals, assistant principals, guidance counselors and other personnel for whom a valid, standard type A, B, C or Lifetime Louisiana Teacher Certificate is required for employment and who have completed three years of successful teaching are eligible to participate in the program. The program was designated the Louisiana Educational Employees Improvement Program (commonly known as PIPS) and it became operational on July 1, 1981. June 30, 1982, marked the end of its first full year of operation.

Purpose

The purpose of this presentation is to provide a sequel to the 1981 presentation. At the time the 1981 presentation on PIPS was made there was no indication as to the extent and type of participation by teachers or administrators. This paper will

provide information on the extent, and nature of, administrator participation in PIPS. This information can be valuable in revising the program and in helping institutions of higher education respond to the staff development needs of local school systems.

A Brief Review

The PIPS program essentially provides a monetary incentive to educators who improve their skills or abilities. The State Committee provides overall guidelines for the conduct of the program. Each prospective participant is required to prepare a five-year plan of professional development and improvement (consisting of both academic and inservice pursuits) which is to be reviewed and approved by the Local Committee. Each participant is required to earn a designated numer of "points" over the life of the plan in order to satisfactorily meet program requirements. Incentive is determined by an index factor. The amount of incentive pay ranges from approximately $1,100 to more than $3,700 per year. A copy of the 1981-82 salary incentive is listed in Appendix A. It was estimated that PIPS program funding was in excess of $60,000,000 and that over 30,000 educators participated.

Participants must earn points in two areas, academic pursuits and inservice projects. Academic pursuits may consist of the following.

(1) Taking relevant college courses at either the graduate or undergraduate level in areas of job certification or job assignment (with some exceptions).
(2) Preparing and conductin approved workshops.
(3) Supervising students teachers (and administrative interns).

(4) Developing and implementing innovative and exemplary programs.

Inservice projects may consist of the following.

(1) Approved conferences.
(2) Approved workshops.
(3) Approved seminars.
(4) Task forces whose purpose is to develop education programs.

The Sample

In order to examine the enrollment experiences of administrators (central office administrators, principals, and assistant principals) two parish (county) school systems were selected to form the sample. The systems were not selected at random but probably represent a reasonable cross-section of the local school systems in the State. The State is divided into primary service areas of respective state universities. One selected school system was located in an area in close proximity to a university and the other system was located in an area remote from any university (25 to 50 miles).

Both systems had about the same number of central office administrators and principals. The system remotely located from any university had only approximately one-third the number of assistant principals of the other school system.

In selecting school systems for the sample consideration was given to the relative accessibility of the information requested. Resources available for gathering data were also a consideration in determining and selecting the sample. Local Committee personnel cooperated in collecting the data.

Findings

The data obtained pertained to the percentage enrollment of eligible participants, and the types of academic pursuits and inservice projects. The types of academic pursuits, and their respective selection by administrators, was determined for both parishes and are presented in Table 1. Table 2 summarizes the number of administrators according to inservice projects.

Table 3 presents the data for formal course enrollment by administrators in either their respective designated "service area" university or "non-service area" university. This information can provide insight into whether or not "service area" universities in fact provide most of the formal course work to administrators participating in the PIPS program.

Table 4 contains samples of formal courses, and Table 5 presents sample inservice projects of administrators. The inservice projects are divided into two broad categories since most administrators enrolled either in workshops or attended conferences and/or conventions.

TABLE 1

Number of Administrators Classified by Academic Pursuits

	School System With a Local University			School System Remotely Located from Any Univ.		
	Cent. Off. Admin.	Prin.	Ass't. Prin.	Cent. Off. Admin.	Prin.	Ass't. Prin.
Total Number	27	38	32	24	30	11
Participants	22	32	30	22	30	11
Percentage	81	84	94	92	100	100
Formal Course	18	32	30	20	30	11
Prep. & Cond. W/S & Seminars	4	0	0	2	0	0
Superv. Stu. Tchrs. & Admin. Interns	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dev. & Implem. Innov. & Exemp. Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
* At Least One Course & One W/S Planned &/or Presented	6	0	1	3	0	1
* At Least One Course & Super. of Stu. Tchrs.	0	0	0	0	6	0

* - Multiple Activities

TABLE 2

Number of Administrators Classified by Inservice Projects

	School System With a Local University			School System Remotely Located from Any Univ.		
	Cent. Off. Admin.	Prin.	Ass't. Prin.	Cent. Off. Admin.	Prin.	Ass't. Prin.
Total Number	27	38	32	24	30	11
Participants	22	32	30	22	30	11
Percentage	81	84	94	92	100	100
Conf. & Conv.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workshops	22	32	30	22	30	11
Seminars	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEU Activities	0	0	0	0	0	0
* Workshops & Conf. & Conv.	7	14	12	7	6	1
* Workshops & Seminars	0	0	0	6	1	0

* - Multiple Activities

TABLE 3

Categories of Universities Attended for Formal Courses (Either Campus or Extension)

	At Least One Course in a Service Area University	Only Course(s) Taken Was in a Non-Service Area University	Total
School System with a Local State University			
Central Office Admin.	16	2	18
Principals	28	4	32
Assistant Principals	29	1	30
School System Remotely Located from Any Univ.			
Central Office Admin.	13	7	20
Principals	26	4	30
Assistant Principals	11	0	11

TABLE 4

Sample Formal Courses Taken by Administrators (Graduate or Undergraduate)

School Finance	Directed Study
Reading (various courses)	Linguistics
Special Projects in Educ.	General Woodworking
Applied Psychology Seminar	School Law
Trends & Issues in Sec. Educ.	Elementary School Mathematics
Free Enterprise	Instructional Mat. & Media
Supervision of Instr. in Elementary Schools	Sports Medicine
	Behavior Management
Human Factors in Admin.	Admin. & Superv. Workshop
Refresher in Special Fields	Increasing Teaching Effect.
Advanced Educ. Measurement	Special Educ. (var. courses)
Curriculum Development	Stress Effects of Teaching

TABLE 5

Sample Inservice Activities of Administrators

Workshops

- Management by Objectives
- School Law: Tchr's. Rights
- Single Parent Families
- Teaching Local History
- Utilizing Local Artists
- Improving Vocal Techniques
- Assertive Discipline
- Listening Skills & the Stud.
- Identifying Except. Children
- Policies and Procedures for Issuing Grades
- Study Skills & the Student
- Developing a Uniform Read. Management System
- Methods of Teaching Word Problems in Math
- Documentation & Organ. of a Hearing
- Motivational Techniques
- Retention & Trans. of Lrn.
- Effective Ldrshp. to Improve Instruction
- Building Relationships in the Superv. Proc.
- CPR
- School Law - Tort Liab.
- Teacher Burnout
- School Law - Current Court Legislative Issues
- School and Community Pub. Rel.
- Time Management
- Dealing with Stress in the Classroom
- Sex Equity in Instruction
- Pupil Appr. Assessment Prg.
- Teaching & Eval. Writing
- Substance Abuse Prevention
- Mainstreaming Emot. Disturbed Students - Adv. & Disadv.
- Utilization of Science for EMR Students
- Classroom Visitation
- Current Problems of Drug Abuse
- Effect. Techn. in Tch. Math.
- Interp. & Use of SRA Test Res.
- Understanding Sec. Gifted
- Child Abuse - Recog. & Resp.
- Hunter Model for Impr. Instr.
- Coping with Change Madness in School
- Improving Reading Instruction
- Special Olympics Workshop
- Games, Gad., Gismos for Math
- Dealing with Problems Assoc. with Alcohol
- Facil. Student Adj. to Divorce/Separation

Conferences/Conventions

- Science Teachers' Conf.
- Statewide & Regional Reading Conferences
- Statewide Principals' Ldrshp. Conference
- Statewide Phys. Educ. Conv.
- Statewide School Executives' Conference

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is clear from the findings that many administrators enrolled in the PIPS program. The program was so attractive that 81% to 100% of the administrators in the sample enrolled in the program. However, the motivation for participation (largely professional development or monetary) was not determined.

For their academic pursuits the vast majority of administrators enrolled in a formal course. The other eligible academic pursuits were selected largely by central office personnel or certain principals in one of the parishes (supervision of student teachers). Formal course work seems to be the preferred choice for meeting the academic pursuits requirements.

Most administrators enrolled in courses offered by their respective "service area" universities. These courses seem to have met the academic pursuit component for a large percentage of administrators.

From the sample listing of inservice projects it can be seen that a wide variety of workshops was the preferred inservice project. A common format for the workshops was six hours of activity for six "points". Conferences and conventions were attended by a smaller percentage of the group. However, workshops and conferences and conventions seem to be the preferred formats for meeting the inservice project requirements.

It is recommended that universities continue to offer a wide variety of courses either on a campus or extension basis for PIPS

participants. Although no determination was made as to which organizations were sponsoring workshops and conferences, institutions of higher education should also offer a wide variety of workshops for participants since that seems to be the favorite format for meeting inservice project requirements.

The PIPS program has brought many administrators into staff development activities. With participation in wisely selected academic pursuits and inservice projects the leadership for Louisiana's public schools should be enhanced.

REFERENCES

Broussard, Rolland L., "Administrator In-Service Education: Structure and Analysis of an Individualized Statewide Incentive Program". Paper presented to the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Seattle, Washington, 1981.

Guidelines: Louisiana Educational Employees Professional Improvement Program. Bulletin 1619. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State Department of Education, 1982.

APPENDIX A

PIPS INCREMENTS TO BE PAID ABOVE THE MINIMUM STATE TEACHER SALARY SCHEDULE

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	BACHELOR'S DEGREE	MASTER'S DEGREE	MASTER'S PLUS 30	SPECIALIST IN. ED.	PH.D. OR ED.D.
3	$1129	$1155	$1155	$1193	$1257
4	1155	1180	1180	1219	1297
5	1180	1219	1225	1266	1337
6	1206	1257	1270	1310	1377
7	1231	1297	1317	1357	1417
8	1257	1337	1364	1404	1457
9	1297	1377	1411	1451	1497
10	1337	1417	1457	1497	1538
11	1437	1457	1504	1544	1578
12	1505	1529	1551	1591	1618
13	1738	1749	1861	1909	1941
14	1738	1894	2016	2068	2103
15	1872	2040	2171	2227	2265
16	1872	2040	2171	2227	2265
17	1872	2040	2171	2227	2265
18	2273	2477	2637	2705	2750
19	2273	2477	2637	2705	2750
20	2273	2477	2637	2705	2750
21	2674	2915	3102	3182	3235
22	2674	2915	3102	3182	3235
23	2674	2915	3102	3182	3235
24	2674	2915	3102	3182	3235
25	3075	3352	3567	3659	3721